

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 and 18-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend Claims 1 and 7.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 11, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al. (US 6,776,861). Claims 1-11 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-11 and 18-21.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“A multilayer composite comprising:
an insulating substrate; and
patterned conductive layers and insulating layers alternately laminated on the insulating substrate to define a laminate; wherein
at least one of the insulating layers defines a correcting insulating layer including vitreous silica and quartz;
the ratio of vitreous silica to quartz in the correcting insulating layer such that the thermal expansion coefficient of the correcting insulating layer differs from that of the insulating layers that do not define the correcting insulating layer, such that the correcting insulating layer corrects the warpage of the laminate attributed to a difference in thermal expansion coefficients between the insulating layers that do not define the correcting insulating layer, the patterned conductive layers, and the insulating substrate; and
each of the insulating layers including the correcting insulating layer are composed of the same materials, and the only difference between the at least one correcting insulating layer and the remaining insulating layers is the ratio of vitreous silica to quartz.” (Emphasis added.)

Claim 7 recites features that are similar to the features recited in Claim 1, including the features emphasized above.

The Examiner alleged that Wang et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' Claims 1 and 7.

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 7 to recite the feature of “each of the insulating layers including the correcting insulating layer are composed of the same materials, and the only difference between the correcting insulating layer and the

remaining insulating layers is the ratio of vitreous silica to quartz.” Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 7 is found, for example, in the second, third and fourth full paragraphs on page 7 of the originally filed specification.

In contrast to Applicants’ Claims 1 and 7, col. 5, lines 18-62 of Wang et al. specifically disclose that the constraining tape, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the correcting insulating layer recited in Applicants’ Claims 1 and 7, and the primary tape, which the Examiner alleged corresponds to the insulating layers recited in Applicants’ Claims 1 and 7, are composed of **different materials**.

Particularly, Wang et al. discloses that the constraining tape preferably includes B_2O_3 , BaO , Li_2O , P_2O_5 , TiO_2 , Cs_2O , and Nd_2O_3 , and that the primary tape preferably includes SiO_2 , Al_2O_3 , B_2O_3 , CaO , MgO , Na_2O , Li_2O , SrO and K_2O . Wang et al. fails to teach or suggest that the constraining tape and the primary tape could or should be made of the same materials, and that the only difference between the constraining tape and the primary tape is the ratio of vitreous silica to quartz.

Therefore, Wang et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of “each of the insulating layers including the correcting insulating layer are composed of the same materials, and the only difference between the correcting insulating layer and the remaining insulating layers is the ratio of vitreous silica to quartz” as recited in Applicants’ Claims 1 and 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Wang et al. fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claims 1 and 7 of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al., and the rejection of Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 7 are allowable. Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 18-21 depend upon allowable

U.S. Serial No. 10/681,877
May 9, 2006
Reply to the Office Action dated January 13, 2006
Page 8 of 8

Claims 1 and 7, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 1 and 7 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a One-month extension of time, extending to May 13, 2006, the period for response to the Office Action dated January 13, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2006

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710